

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

MANUEL CARDENAS,

Plaintiff,

SA-25-CV-00347-FB

VS.

COUNTY MANAGER DAVID SMITH,
BEXAR COUNTY, JUSTICE OF THE
PEACE, PRECINCT 4,

Defendants.

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

To the Honorable United States District Judge Fred Biery:

This Report and Recommendation concerns the above-styled cause of action. This case was referred to the undersigned for an order on Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP") and a review of the pleadings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). The undersigned has authority to enter this recommendation pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). For the reasons set forth below, it is recommended that this action be dismissed for want of prosecution and failure to follow courts orders.

I. Background and Analysis

All parties instituting any civil action, suit, or proceeding in a district court of the United States, except an application for a writ of habeas corpus, must pay a filing fee of \$350, as well as an administrative fee.¹ *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a). When faced with a request to proceed IFP, courts must

¹ The administrative fee, which is currently \$50, is waived for plaintiffs who are granted IFP status. See *District Court Miscellaneous Fee Schedule*, available at <http://www.uscourts.gov/services-forms/fees/district-court-miscellaneous-fee-schedule>.

examine the financial condition of the applicant to determine whether the payment of fees would cause an undue financial hardship. *Prows v. Kastner*, 842 F.2d 138, 140 (5th Cir. 1988). The district court exercises discretion in determining whether to extend the privilege of IFP status to plaintiffs who are unable to pay filing fees. *Wickerham v. Waterman*, No. SA-14-CA-766-XR, 2014 WL 5469816, at *4 (W.D. Tex. Oct. 28, 2014) (citing *Startti v. United States*, 415 F.2d 1115, 1116 (5th Cir. 1969)). In doing so, the Court must examine the demand on plaintiff's financial resources, including whether his expenses are discretionary or mandatory. *Prows*, 842 F.2d at 140. Although one need not be absolutely destitute to enjoy the benefit of IFP status, an application to proceed IFP is only sufficient if it indicates that the plaintiff truly cannot, because of poverty, afford to pay for the costs of litigation and still provide for himself and his dependents. *Adkins v. E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.*, 335 U.S. 331, 339 (1948).

Plaintiff Manuel Cardenas filed this case on April 1, 2025, by filing a motion to proceed IFP and a proposed Complaint [#1]. Plaintiff's motion left multiple sections of the IFP form blank, including how much money he has in checking or savings accounts and the value of his assets. The motion therefore lacked sufficient detail for the Court to ensure he is not able to afford court fees and costs. Therefore, on April 8, 2025, the Court ordered Plaintiff to supplement his IFP motion with additional information before ruling on the motion [#3].

Additionally, Plaintiff's proposed Complaint lacks sufficient detail for the Court to evaluate whether it states a claim upon which relief could be granted. He claims that Defendants discriminated against him based on his race. Plaintiff did not explain how his eviction or arrest were related to his race, nor did he explain how his claims were timely under the relevant statutes of limitation. Thus, the Court ordered Plaintiff to file a More Definite Statement to supplement his proposed Complaint [#3].

Plaintiff's supplement to his IFP motion and his More Definite Statement were due on or before April 22, 2025. To date, Plaintiff has not filed either of these documents with the Court. A district court may dismiss an action for failure to prosecute or to comply with any order of the court. *McCullough v. Lynaugh*, 835 F.2d 1126, 1127 (5th Cir. 1988) (per curiam); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). The Court warned Plaintiff that a failure to file an amended pleading could result in the dismissal of this case for failure to prosecute or comply with a Court order. (Order [#3].) In light of Plaintiff's failure to file the ordered supplement to his IFP motion or More Definite Statement, the undersigned will recommend dismissal of this case for want of prosecution and failure to follow court orders.

II. Conclusion and Recommendation

Having considered the record in this case and governing law, the undersigned recommends that this case be **DISMISSED** for want of prosecution.

III. Instructions for Service and Notice of Right to Object/Appeal

The United States District Clerk shall serve a copy of this report and recommendation on all parties by either (1) electronic transmittal to all parties represented by attorneys registered as a "filing user" with the clerk of court, or (2) by mailing a copy to those not registered by certified mail, return receipt requested. Written objections to this report and recommendation must be filed **within fourteen (14) days** after being served with a copy of same, unless this time period is modified by the district court. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The party shall file the objections with the Clerk of Court and serve the objections on all other parties. A party filing objections must specifically identify those findings, conclusions or recommendations to which objections are being made and the basis for such objections; the district court need not consider frivolous, conclusive or general objections. A party's failure to file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions and recommendations contained in this report shall bar the party from a *de novo* determination by

the district court. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149–52 (1985); *Acuña v. Brown & Root, Inc.*, 200 F.3d 335, 340 (5th Cir. 2000). Additionally, failure to file timely written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions and recommendations contained in this report and recommendation shall bar the aggrieved party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking on appeal the un-objected-to proposed factual findings and legal conclusions accepted by the district court. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428–29 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded by statute on other grounds*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

SIGNED this 30th day of April, 2025.



ELIZABETH S. ("BETSY") CHESTNEY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE